

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-9 and 11-21 are allowed and that claim 10 contains allowable subject matter. Thus, all of the claims of record have been indicated as at least being allowable.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for rejoining the previously withdrawn claims upon the indication of allowable subject matter in the generic claims.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner argues that the phrase “hardness of the soft material is 40 degrees” or lower is indefinite because the hardness of materials is measured in durometers, not degrees. In response, claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the soft flexible material is rubber having a value of 40 or lower in hardness when measured by a durometer. Although the specification does not expressly recite the hardness of the soft flexible material being measured by a “durometer,” Applicant respectfully submits that those skilled in the art will understand, from a reading of the specification, that the hardness of such soft flexible materials is measured by a durometer. Therefore, that which was inherent from the disclosure to those of ordinary skill in the art is now expressly set forth. Thus, no new matter has been entered into the disclosure by way of the present amendment to claim 10.

In the previous Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the drawings do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner argued that the hold member

having a solid part in the rear of the holder tube and a hollow part in the front side ahead of the solid part must be shown or the features canceled from claim 4. In response, Applicant argued that the features of claim 4 are shown in Figure 3 of the Drawings. Specifically, Applicant argued that Figure 3 illustrates a hold member having "a solid part 42 is placed in the rear end side in the holder tube 5" and "a cylindrical part 44 formed with a hollow part 43 at the axial center is placed nearer to the front end than the solid part 42" (see page 18, lines 8-16). In the Final Official Action, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's previous argument and reiterates such objection.

Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's reasoning, in order to advance prosecution, claim 4 has been canceled, thereby rendering the objection to the Drawings moot.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be

allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Spinelli
Registration No.: 39,533



Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
TS:cm/jam